

spare parts, is about 1.1 billion 1995 dollars. Buying 20 more B-2s would consume only 1 percent of the defense budget and 5 percent of the combat aircraft budget for a few years. And doing so would prevent the irreparable dispersal of the industrial base that has produced the most sophisticated weapon ever, a weapon suited to the changed world.

In 1960 there were 81 major U.S. air bases overseas. Today there are 15. The B-2's long range responds to the dwindling of forward-based U.S. forces. Its high payload and stealthiness (the difficulty of detecting its approach) enable it to do extraordinary damage to an adversary's warmaking capacity, at minimum risk to just two crew members per aircraft. This gives a president a powerful instrument of credible deterrence for an era in which Americans are increasingly reluctant to risk casualties. The importance of a military technology tailored to this political fact is argued by Edward Luttwak in his essay "Toward Post-Heroic Warfare" in *Foreign Affairs*.

Luttwak, of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, says the end of the Cold War has brought a "new season of war," in which wars are "easily started and then fought without perceptible restraint." A war such as the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait can menace the material interests of the United States. And a war such as that in the former Yugoslavia can, Luttwak argues, injure the nation's "moral economy" if the nation "remains the attentive yet passive witness of aggression replete with atrocities on the largest scale."

Perhaps Americans find their "moral economy" too taxing to maintain in today's turbulent world. The debacle of American policy regarding Bosnia strongly suggests that is so. If so, America faces a future in which only one thing is certain: it will never again be what it has been, the principal force for good in the world. But if America wants to be intolerant both of evil and of casualties, it needs to arm itself appropriately, as with the B-2.

It is the only aircraft that can on short notice go anywhere on the planet with a single refueling, penetrate the most sophisticated air defenses and deliver high payloads of conventional weapons with devastating precision. Five B-2s can deliver as many weapons as the entire force of F-117s (America's only other stealth aircraft) deployed in Desert Storm. Four U.S.-based B-2s with eight crew members could have achieved by same results as were achieved by the more than 100 aircraft sent against Libya in 1986. Military personnel are not only precious as a matter of morality, they are expensive. True, many targets can be attacked with "stand-off weapons," such as cruise missiles, but such weapons are 20 to 40 times more expensive than direct attack precision weapons. Calculating the real costs of weapons is more complicated than reading restaurant bills.

And as Luttwak argues, cost-effectiveness criteria for weapons often do not factor in the value of casualty avoidance, which is a function of casualty exposure and is often the decisive restraint on political leadership when it is considering whether to project U.S. power. "When judged very expensive, stealth planes are implicitly compared to non-stealth aircraft of equivalent range and payload, not always including the escorts that the latter also require, which increase greatly the number of fliers at risk. Missing from such calculations is any measure of the overall foreign policy value of acquiring a means of casualty-free warfare by unescorted bomber."

Will the nation need a substantial B-2 force? That depends on developments in the world, and on what America wants to be in the world. On a wall at the Jet Propulsion

Laboratory in Pasadena there reportedly use to be a sign: We do precision guesswork. So do the people who must anticipate crises relevant to America's material interests and moral economy, and the means of meeting them. Twenty more B-2s would be a responsible guess.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON]. He is a very articulate and a very strong supporter of national defense. I also thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] who was really the father of this special order. Thanks to Mr. DICKS for taking this order up.

I think it is important to talk about these things, because a lot of folks have 100 issues on their minds. They do not know what this vote is about until they actually sit down and think about it. And also the gentleman who was here earlier, Mr. LEWIS. Mr. LEWIS does not spend a lot of time talking on the House Floor. He is one of the smartest defense minds in this Congress and he is a real advocate for this program and one of our champions. I am glad he was up here discussing this with Mr. DICKS.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

□ 1630

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I will just say one final thing. One of the other articles General Skantze wrote, one of the big problems has been, ever since the Air Force reorganized and got rid of the Strategic Air Command, there really has not been an advocate for bombers inside the Air Force. They will advocate for the F-22 and the C-17, but nobody stands up for bombers, and I think that is one of the things where the Congress may have to step in. We may have to reconsider that decision and recreate a Strategic Air Command within the Air Force so we have some real attention by the service on this subject. I think we ought to consider that.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1802

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 201 and rule

XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2099.

□ 1803

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, title V was open for amendment at any point.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENSIGN

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENSIGN: Page 87, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 519. The amount otherwise provided in title I of this Act for "DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS—VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—MEDICAL CARE", the amount otherwise provided in title III of this Act for "NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT", and the amount otherwise provided in title III of this Act for "NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES" are, respectively, increased to a total of \$16,961,000,000, reduced by \$89,500,000, and reduced by \$235,000,000.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for a time limitation of 15 minutes total split equally between the two sides on the Ensign amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] will be recognized for 7½ minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN].

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment to ensure that we keep the promises made to our veterans. The Ensign amendment is about the contract with those who have served our Nation honorably without fundamentally altering the priorities set forth in the bill before us today.

First, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. LEWIS, for making tough choices. In most instances, the VA/HUD subcommittee has accommodated or exceeded the President's requested funding levels in veterans programs such as compensation and pensions, readjustment benefits, and extended care facility grants.